

Viterbo University  
Differentiation in the Classroom Using Technology

1 Graduate Credit Fall 2010

Instructor: Tammy Lind

Location: Shorewood School District

Dates&Time: December 4<sup>th</sup>, 8:00-4:30

Email: [lind.tammy@gmail.com](mailto:lind.tammy@gmail.com)

Phone: 414.331.5292

Availability: Office hours available upon request

Course Description:

Educators will explore ways to differentiate instruction in the classroom through Web 2.0 technologies. Exploration of multiple intelligences, clustering and other strategies will take place. Participants will develop differentiated materials for a lesson/unit and share these resources online with other instructors.

Objectives:

Upon successful completion of this course, each student should be able to:

- ☐ Expand their knowledge of online technology tools that can be used to help differentiate instruction
- ☐ Develop technology-enriched lesson plan that enables students to pursue their individual curiosities and become active participants in setting their own educational goals, managing their own learning, and assessing their own progress
- ☐ Teachers will be able to customize and personalize learning activities to address students' diverse learning styles, working strategies, and abilities using digital tools and resources

**INTASC Standards:** List the Teaching Standard(s) addressed in this course (see attached INTASC list)

#2 The teacher understands how children with broad ranges of ability learn and provides instruction that supports their intellectual, social, and personal development.

#3 The teacher understands how pupils differ in their approaches to learning and the barriers that impede learning and can adapt instruction to meet the diverse needs of pupils, including those with disabilities and exceptionalities.

#4 The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies, including the use of technology to encourage children's development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.

#5 The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

#7 The teacher organizes and plans systematic instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, pupils, the community, and curriculum goals.

#9 The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effect of his or her choices and actions on pupils, parents, professionals in the learning community and others and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Conceptual Framework: The Viterbo University Graduate Studies in Education Program has adopted a Teacher As Reflective Decision Maker Model and the Wisconsin Standards for Teacher Development and Licensure, also known as INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) Standards. Each course is designed to contribute to the development of one or more of the WI/INTASC Standards and if applicable, IRA and/or ISLLC Standards. Franciscan values permeate the program. The focus of every professional education course is on the learning of the PK-12 pupil. Viterbo education courses infuse constructivist practices, use of technology, PK-12 collaboration, awareness of diversity, traditional and authentic assessment, research, and real-world experiences into the professional development of the teacher.

#### Methodology:

“Much of what a teacher needs to know (and know how to do) is learned in the context of practice” (Schlanger & Fusco, 2003). The methodology for this course is situated around teacher practice. In other words the design of the professional development is not geared to how to use the technology, but instead on how it can be used to enhance the practice of teaching and learning. The course supports educators in the evolution of more constructivist styles of teaching with technology. Constructivist or student centered teaching environments are strongly connected to real life and are conducive to incorporating these skills into instruction. In constructivist teaching pedagogy, the roles of teachers and students change. Teachers facilitate learning environments in which students construct deep meaning through solving problems by building on prior knowledge structures. The following table shows the differences between transmission and constructivist teaching styles.

	<b>Transmission Pedagogy</b>	<b>Constructivist Pedagogy</b>
Classroom Activity	Teacher-Centered Didactic	Student-Centered Interactive
Teacher Role	Fact Teller Always Expert	Collaborator Sometimes Learner
Student Role	Listener Always Learner	Collaborator Sometimes Expert
Instructional Emphasis	Facts Memorization	Relationships Inquiry & Invention
Concept of Knowledge	Accumulation of Facts	Relationships Inquiry & Invention
Demonstration of Success	Quantity	Quality
Assessment	Multiple-Choice Items	Portfolios and Performances
Technology Use	Drill and Practice	Communication, Collaboration, Information Access, Expression

Sandholtz, Ringstaff, & Dwyer (1997)

According to Henry, Jenkins, a prominent researcher at MIT, in order for students to be prepared for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century they need to be engaged in participatory cultures. "A participatory culture is a culture with relatively low barriers to artistic expression and civic engagement, strong support for creating and sharing one's creations, and some type of informal mentorship whereby what is known by the most experienced is passed along to novices. A participatory culture is also one in which members believe their contributions matter, and feel some degree of social connection with one another (at the least they care what other people think about what they have created (Jenkins, Clinton, Purushotma, Robison, & Weigel, 2006).

Web 2.0 tools allow students increased engagement and Motivation, a context to create content with an authentic purpose and audience. These tools also allow for increased collaboration. Students can connect with peers and experts using the tools of the 21st century workplace.

(Bjørke, 2004) (Cole & Engestrom, 1993) (Cradler, Freeman, Cradler, & McNabb, 2002) (Dede, 2005)

Americans with Disabilities Act:

If you are a student with a disability and require auxiliary aids, services or other accommodations for this class, please see the instructor to discuss your accommodation needs.

Assignments and Requirements:

Web 2.0 Tools: Application & Analysis 25% of Overall Grade

Due December 20, 2010

Participants will identify a minimum of two Web 2.0 sites that have potential to help differentiate instruction for students.

Prepare a one page report for each tool with the following headers:

1. Url of the site and brief description of tool
2. How this site can be adapted to the school setting; individual classroom setting; any other educational group;
3. Rationale why this specific site will assist with differentiation in the classroom setting
4. Include advantages and any cautions/preparation that might be needed when implementing the tool

\*\*Options on how this assignment will be communicated will be discussed in class.

Participation in Course Wiki Discussion Board 50% of Overall Grade

Due December 20, 2010

Participants will be required to use the discussion board section of our class wiki to do the following:

1. Choose a student that would benefit from using a Web 2.0 tools to differentiate classroom activities.
2. Give a brief description of student and explain special learning needs (no names please).
3. Explain what Web 2.0 tools participant plans to use with student and describe plan to implement in educational program.

4. Include a description of how the Web 2.0 tool can be adapted to specific student needs
5. Explain how students will improve knowledge and/or communication through this tool

#### Personal Reflection Document 25% of Overall Grade

Due December 20, 2010

Participants will create a Google Document to reflect on the use of Web 2.0 tools with students that benefit from differentiation. Explain what tools you used and what student needs you were trying to address.

(Remember no student names). Explain how implementation worked in classroom including any challenges you encountered. Did the tool help improve student knowledge and/or communication? If so, how? What evidence do you have to show this occurred?

Participant will share this Google Document with instructor.

Evaluation Method:

100-93=A 92-91=A- 90-88=B+ 87-85=B 84-82=B- 81-78=C+ 77-75=C 74-70=C- 69-67=D+ 66-64=D 63-60=D- Lower than 60=F

Note: If a student's work cannot be handed in by June 26th, this must be brought to the attention of the instructor and approved prior to the due date to prevent a lower grade. Circumstances beyond the control of the student will be considered on an individual basis.

#### General Course Expectations

Because of the collaborative nature of this program, it is crucial that students attend the entire each time that we meet. Active class participation is expected.

It is expected that all work will be turned in or presented on the assigned dates. Any deviation from the assigned dates must be cleared with the instructor.

Policy on Attendance Due to the collaborative nature of this course, Attendance is mandatory.

Policy on Late or Missing Assignments All original course assignments and additional assignments described above should be completed within the course time limits. Work that is submitted after the course has been completed is subject to the provision of the policies and procedures relating to incompletes.

### Web 2.0 Tools: Application and Analysis 25%

Purpose: Participants will identify a minimum of two Web 2.0 sites/tools that can be used with struggling students.

General Information: The scale ranges from 1 to 4 with 4 being exemplary. If the student receives a score below 3.5, the instructor will provide specific feedback on his/her concerns. One re-submit is permitted.

4	3	2	1
Complete a description of how the Web 2.0 tool can be adapted to specific student needs is complete.	The description of how the Web 2.0 tool can be adapted is brief and not tied to a specific student need.	Description of how a Web 2.0 tool could be adapted was not realistic or did not fit the student needs or the capabilities of the tool	Unsure this point was presented
Thorough rationale provided how students will improve knowledge and/or communication	Rationale provided how students will improve knowledge or communication	Rationale provided how students will improve knowledge or communication is not appropriate for the tool	Unsure this point was presented
Includes complete explanation of why the tool is appropriate for identified student needs is complete	The explanation of why the tool is appropriate for the identified student is not clear.	The explanation of why the tool is appropriate for identified student needs is not clear and is not tied to a specific audience	Unsure this point was presented
Advantages and/or cautions that may be necessary when implementing the tool were explained.	Advantages and/or cautions appropriate to audience are unclear.	Advantages and/or cautions are not appropriate to audience.	Unsure this point was presented

Missing equals zero points

14-16 = A	15 = A-	14 = B+	13 = B	12 =B-
11 = C+	10 = C	9 = C-	8 = D+	7 = D
6 = D-	Below 5 = F			

### Participation in Class Wiki Discussion Board 50%

Purpose: This is to provide students with specific feedback on the class wiki activity.

General Information: The scale ranges from 1 to 5 with 4 being acceptable and 5 being exemplary. If the student receives a score below 3.5, the instructor will provide specific feedback on his/her concerns.

5-4	3-2	1	Score
Student was identified and description of learning needs was complete.	Student was identified and description of learning needs was not complete.	Unsure this point was presented	
Explanation of Web 2.0 and implementation with student demonstrated understanding of how tool increased student learning.	Explanation of Web 2.0 and implementation with student demonstrated some understanding of how tool increased student learning.	. Unsure this point was presented	
Details of implementation were provided as well as challenges to implementation.	Some details of implementation were provided as well as challenges to implementation	Unsure this point was presented	
Possible Score:			15 points _____

Missing work equals zero points.

A = 14-15 B+ = 13 B = 12 C+ = 11 C = 10 C- = 9  
D = 8 D- = 7 F = Below 6

## Personal Reflection Document 25%

### Topic: Personal Reflection Document

Acceptable 5-4 points	Needs Work 3-2 point	Unacceptable 1 points
It is evident that the participant understood the materials shared in this class  Reflection clearly identified how they one can immediately use Web 2.0 tools in a personal, professional, or academic settings.	Participant can identify Web 2.0 tool and/or some uses but not clearly.  Participant identifies tools however, he/she does not tie to immediate use in any area.	It is difficult to tell if the participant understands Web 20 tools and their possibilities.  It is difficult to tell if participant can see immediate connections

Missing work equals zero points.

**Total possible points = 10**

A 10 A- 9 B 8 C 7 F Lower than 7
-------------------------------------

## Texts and Readings

All resources used in this course will be linked electronically using the course Wiki located at <http://differentiationweb2franklin.wikispaces.com/>